

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 16, 2006. The following claims are pending in the application: Claims 154 to 156, 158 to 164, 166 to 171, 173 to 176, 180, 207 to 210, and 212 to 215. Of these claims, Claims 154 and 210 are still the only independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Before turning to the substantive merits of the Office Action, two formal matters are addressed. First, Applicants direct attention to the Substitute Specification submitted with the Amendment dated July 5, 2001. Careful checking of the application does not show that the Substitute Specification has been acknowledged or approved. It is therefore respectfully requested to receive an indication that the Substitute Specification is approved.

Second, with respect to Information Disclosure Statements, Applicants have not yet received an indication that art cited in the following three Information Disclosure Statements has been considered and made formally of record: Information Disclosure Statements dated May 16, 2006, June 14, 2006, and January 5, 2007. An indication that this art has been considered and made formally of record is respectfully requested.

It should be noted that a further Information Disclosure Statement accompanies this Amendment. Consideration of the art cited therein is also respectfully requested.

Turning to the merits of the Office Action, all claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), primarily over U.S. Patent 5,552,816 (Oda) in view of Japan 4-32577 (Takise). In response, the substance of dependent Claims 166 and 212 has been incorporated into each of independent Claims 154 and 210, respectively. This should therefore be viewed as a traversal of the rejection, as indicated more fully below.

The invention concerns a liquid container having a main body, a supply port, and first and second engaging portions respectively adapted for engagement with first and second locking portions of a holder to which the liquid container is detachably mountable. According to one aspect of the invention, the second engaging portion is supported on a supporting member at an outside thereof, and the supporting member is extended downwardly from a portion adjacent a top portion.

In entering the rejection of now-cancelled Claims 165 and 211 (which specified that the supporting member extends upwardly) and Claims 166 and 212 (which specify that the supporting member extends downwardly), the Office Action conceded that Oda does not disclose or suggest any such arrangement. Rather, reliance was placed on Takise, specifically, Figures 3a through 3c of Takise. See page 4 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that such reliance is misplaced.

In particular, Takise is not seen to disclose or to suggest that his supporting member extends downwardly from a portion adjacent a top portion. Rather, the best that might possibly be said of Takise, and this point is not conceded, is that Takise might show an arrangement in which the supporting member extends upwardly.

In other rejections, the Office Action further relied on U.S. Patent 4,771,295 (Baker) and European 546,832 (Wada). These documents have been reviewed, but they are not seen to disclose anything pertinent to the above-noted deficiencies in Oda and Takise.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the claims herein define subject matter that would not have been obvious from any permissible combination of the applied art, and allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants
Michael K. O'Neill
Registration No. 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 126240v1